

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/723,195	WIRKUS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tu M. Nguyen	3748	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Tu M. Nguyen (examiner).

(3) John Wirkus (inventor).

(2) Scott Smith (attorney).

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 16 June 2005.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: models of the invention by Lewis and the invention of the pending application are shown.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 11, 21, 23, 32, and 34.

Identification of prior art discussed: Khair et al. (U.S. Patent 6,138,649) and Lewis (U.S. Patent 5,027,781).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Tu M. Nguyen
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Re claims 1, 11, 21, 23, and 34, the proposed amendment that specifies a screen without a catalyst or an intake pipe located at an exhaust manifold is able to overcome the prior art of record and renders the claims allowable pending further search and consideration. The proposed amendment, however, may not be entered. Re claim 32, applicant's argument that the screen in Lewis is not affixed to the intake pipe with an interference fix is persuasive. Therefore, claim 32 appears allowable pending further search and consideration.